

# AWA'RENESS

The quarterly journal of Contact (UK)

SUMMER 1979

## AWARENESS

Summer 1979.

(A Contact (UK) Publication)

Volume 8, no: 2.

## Editorial Address

19 Cumnor Road,  
Wootton, Boar's Hill,  
Nr.Oxford, Oxon.

## Contents

Editorial.....	page 1.
"DOES A CRIPPLED SPACE CRAFT ORBIT EARTH?", by Pablo F.Fenjves and Henry Gris.....	page 2.
TOWARDS AN IMPROVED UFO TERMINOLOGY: SOME SUGGESTIONS, by Jenny Randles and Peter Warrington.....	pages 3-8.
REPORT FROM CONTACT INTERNATIONAL MEXICO, by Ian C.M.Norrie.....	pages 9-10.
THE FIRST LONDON INTERNATIONAL UFO CONGRESS, by J.B.Delair.....	pages 10-12.
Readers' Letters.....	pages 13-15.
Book Reviews, by J.B.Delair.....	pages 16-18.
Advertisements.....	pages 19-20.

The Contact (UK) Directory.

National Chairman: F.W.Passey. 59D Windmill Road, Headington, Oxford.

Hon.Secretary: J.Loveridge. 3 Maltfield Road, Headington, Oxford.

Hon.Treasurer: D.N.Mansell. 48 Crown Road, Wheatley, near Oxford, Oxon.

Hon.Membership Secretary: Mrs S.Robb. 28 Lodden Avenue, Berinsfield, Oxon.

Public Relations Officer: P.Flatman. 17 Quarhill Close, Over Norton, Oxon.

Research Enquiries: J.Sears and P.Flatman. C/o Wheatley address above.

Senior Research Officer: D.N.Mansell. 48 Crown Road, Wheatley, nr.Oxford, Oxon.

Research Programme Co-ordinator and Librarian: J.B.Delair. 19 Cumnor Road, Wot-  
ton, Boar's Hill, nr.Oxford, Oxon.

Archivist: E.Cox. C/o Wheatley address above.

Editorial

There will be no editorial proper this month due to (a) space limitations, and (b) the fact that quite extraordinary time-consuming pressures are currently being experienced by your editor. He even feels that from time to time you will be relieved at not having to wade through yet another editorial. Nonetheless, apologies are tendered at the lateness of this issue, due to circumstances beyond normal control

The Editor.

Unless otherwise stated, all material printed in this issue is copyright CONTACT (UK) 1979. Permission to reprint same may be obtainable on application.

"DOES A CRIPPLED SPACE CRAFT ORBIT EARTH?"

by

Pablo F. Fenjves and Henry Gris.

Leading Russian scientists, Prof. Sergei Bozhich and Dr Vladimir Azhazha, claim that a damaged alien space craft is orbiting Earth, and speculate that one or more dead humanoids may still be on board. Bozhich said: "We are convinced that a crippled spacecraft from another planet is circling earth". Azhazha has added: "There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that we are dealing with the remains of a large alien craft. It must hold secrets we haven't even dreamed of".

This bombshell news, given such minute press coverage in England, seems to have been confirmed in the USA by certain sources. Dr Henry Monteith, for example, who is doing classified research for the American government, has commented: "It's very exciting. It certainly sounds like a solid study".

The Russians first spotted the alien object 1,240 miles above the Earth in the early 1960's, but only now, after years of study are they absolutely convinced that it truly is a alien spacecraft. They believe that the craft was broken into ten pieces by, perhaps, an internal explosion, with the two largest remaining sections being about 100 feet in diameter. Sophisticated computers were used to track the orbits of the ten pieces back in time, and, said Dr Bozhich, "We discovered that they all originated in the same spot on the same day - Dec. 18th., 1955 - obviously the result of a powerful explosion". He added: "We are convinced that the objects are not from Earth". Support for this contention comes from the fact that the first manmade satellite (Russia's Sputnik I) was not launched into space until October 1957.

Noted Russian astrophysicist, Prof. Aleksandr Kazantsev, has also remarked: "The size of the two big pieces would lead one to assume that the craft was at least 200 feet in length and up to 100 feet in width, with small domes housing telescopes, saucer antennae for communications and portholes for visual contact. Its size would suggest several floors, possibly five".

American specialists have ruled out the possibility of these objects being orbiting meteors, which, according to Dr Lee Rickard of the National Radio Astronomy Centre and Observatory in Charlottesville, Va., are "a million to one shot". Dr Azhazha concurs: "Meteors do not have orbits; they plummet aimlessly about, hurtling erratically through space. All the evidence our scientists have gathered over the past decade points conclusively to one thing: I repeat, an alien craft exploded, crippled by a technical malfunction. It is entirely possible that the lifeless bodies of the alien crew members are still aboard the craft. It boggles the mind".

Interestingly, astronomer John P. Bagby, writing in the prestigious journal Icarus, in 1969, came to more or less the same conclusion, although he did not call the debris he discussed bits of an alien craft. His article considered "at least 10 close natural moonlets which broke off from a larger parent body". Bagby also arrived at the same date for the explosion - Dec. 18th., 1955, and added: "It is assumed that this is the date when the parent body broke up".

Dr Myron Malkin, director of the Space Shuttle programme at NASA's headquarters, has said that NASA would consider salvaging the pieces if the Russians approached them to undertake a joint effort.

The point is, if such a joint retrieval venture was launched, would the prizes be natural objects (a la Bagby) or alien objects (a la Bozhich and Azhazha)?

# "TOWARDS AN IMPROVED UFO TERMINOLOGY: SOME SUGGESTIONS"

by

Jenny Randles & Peter Warrington \*

## Introduction:

It is a fact that if we are to make Ufology acceptable as a branch of science, a primary prerequisite is that we have an agreed, standardised, and rigid terminology. This is an area to which we have addressed ourselves in some depth. Our ideas and conclusions have been discussed with some of Britain's leading ufoologists and a brief review of them was featured in vol.24 of Flying Saucer Review. One of the outcomes of these deliberations and formulation of a provisional set of terminological rules was the concept of an Investigation Level. This, although advocated for some time, seems for unfathomed reasons to be rather slow in gaining.

We should like to cover the scope of ideas upon which we feel (like the others alluded to above) we have a contribution to make. Below, we attempt a summary of these ideas, not in alphabetical order but in a sequence dictated more by logical progression within the fabric of the ufo phenomenon. We appreciate that not every reader will necessarily agree with all our statements, but we do challenge them to furnish convincingly improved definitions and terminology. Only by such exchange and refinement of viewpoints will the ideal situation expressed in the opening sentence of this article ever be fully realised.

## UFOS:

We feel strongly that this term, though well entrenched in the literature, in the media, and among the public at large, is inappropriate. We recommend a substitution, and recognize that, owing to its current widespread usage, acceptance of the proposed replacement --- UAP (Unidentified Atmospheric Phenomenon) --- may be difficult. Consequently we provide an interim measure whereby specific definitions of UFO, IFO, and TRUE UFO are reviewed. These latter three terms cover the three basic categories with which ufoologists regularly deal.

This new term covers any phenomenon --- material or non-material --- which may give rise to what can be called TRUE UFOs. Since we must not presuppose a material existence for the phenomenon (if we are to remain objective) it is vital to recognize that previously used terms fall short of the ideal and that the new UAP term more precisely accommodates what is reportedly observed by so many people. Flying Object is certainly an invalid presupposition, as is Aerial Phenomenon (another often used term). Retention of Unidentifiable, however, is essential, since the "unidentified" aspect of the problem is relative and are not interested here in, say, artificial satellites (which might legitimately be unidentified to those who had never previously seen one or who are unfamiliar with their characteristics).

## PHRASES:

We tend to use the expressions "report" and "sighting" in interchangeable fashion. Here we propose that henceforth they should not be so used. There are clear psychological factors involved in a witness perceiving an event, and further similar processes between that perception and its reporting. Such component stages, therefore must have distinctive and specific terms, by which they may be unambiguously segregated. Below, we refer to UFO in our terminology. This term should be ideally replaced by our newly proposed term UAP, as discussed above. The following three distinct phases can be traced as basal to every ufo case.

---

\* NUFON, 23 Sunningdale Drive, Irlam, Salford, M30 6NJ.

- (i) UFO EVENT describes the stimulus that is present (this is perhaps natural, but equally may not be).
- (ii) UFO SIGHTING is the phenomenon perceived (i.e., an eyewitness description of it).
- (iii) UFO REPORT is the final written or taped statement describing what the eyewitness allegedly saw.

It is important to note that in (ii) the eyewitness may not actually view the whole of any one ufo event (i), or may not recall portions of an event properly, so the very word "sighting" has a constraint placed upon its conventional meaning and usage. In the present context "sighting" really signifies "personalised viewing". Demonstrations of this factor often occur in multi-witness cases, the later individual statements describing the event with varying details. From this it has to be concluded that some witnesses register certain observations more than others and in different order, or to a different degree than some co-witnesses. In multi-witness cases such varying testimony actually helps towards a more accurate reconstruction of what actually occurred; but in single witness cases no such "aids" are to hand, and may well reflect only a part of such cases in the relevant eyewitness depositions.

It is also important to note that in (iii) depositions include the subtle interaction of witness memory, the ability to communicate observations factually and unambiguously, and field investigator manipulation (this latter factor is sometimes inadvertant, but on other occasions apparently deliberate). A UFO REPORT is, in fact, a witness/investigator hybrid.

#### UFO CLASSIFICATION:

This is an extremely important aspect of ufology, because it is vital to the process we call "data transfer". As the system developed by Hynek is the most widely adopted and is, in our view, the most simple, we decided that a modified version of it (to accommodate facets to be detailed below) would suffice. Our modifications have been based upon the updating, clarification, and an increase in the "data transfer" potential of this system. This was seemingly achieved by defining the underlisted seven categories.

1. Low Definition (code LOW), to embrace any phenomenon seen day or night where no clearly defined shape is visible (i.e., the phenomenon has colour, luminosity, possibly motion, and perhaps sound). Such phenomena may even land but leave no trace of having done so. Since it has no definite shape it is, despite possibly landing, still classified as a Low Definition case.

At this juncture we should note that, in our classification system, any phenomenon that lands, or gives the impression of doing so, is coded with an L in parenthesis.

2. Medium Definition (code MED), Similar to the above except that a clear shape is distinguishable for the phenomenon (one assumes that the actual shape is unusual, although this need not necessarily be always so).

3. Instrumentally Detected (code INST), a phenomenon that is detected on radar, or which is recorded on film. Two subdivisions of this category occur, viz: one comprising cases in which a phenomenon is seen by unaided human eyes simultaneously to its detection by radar or photographic recording; and two comprising cases in which phenomenon is not seen by human witnesses but is instrumentally detected.

These subdivisions might be conveniently distinguished INST(a) and INST(b) cases. Many photographic cases are on record in which UAPs occur on film but which were invisible to the photographer at the times of exposure.

The different types of instrumental detection may be coded as (P) for photographs, (F) for films, and (R) for radar. The Hynek Radar/Visual plus photographic cases (which in Hynek's system are not segregated from any other event) fall into this general category.

4. Close Encounters of the First Kind (code CE I). We do not believe that an arbitrary distance factor is a logical method of differentiating between cases. Witness estimates of distances are notoriously unreliable while, in any event, who can decide what a relevant distance (50 metres, 100 metres, etc) should be? We argue that a close encounter should involve the phenomenon being "experienced", i.e., an interaction between witness and phenomenon or between the phenomenon and the natural environment, or between all three.

For example, an electromagnetic (EM) car case, or a paralysis effect, or a deep psychological interaction (e.g. acute fear), or a case involving observable effects upon local flora and fauna (e.g., animal panic, trees bending).

In such cases added data is available about the relevant events, sometimes abundantly so, and which may be of much importance.

For a CE I case, therefore, we believe that it should merely reflect TRANSIENT effects (i.e., only those detectable by the witnesses to the event, that none of the effects are post detectable, and that a knowledge of their occurrence depends wholly upon eyewitness testimony).

5. Close Encounters of the Second Kind (code CE II). As above, except that the effects are semi-permanent being thus detectable by non-witnesses (including investigators). Such effects include ground traces, magnetised or burnt-out instruments, and lasting physiological changes in eyewitnesses. Such material provides permanent (or semi permanent) and scientifically malleable evidence.

So far we feel that our revised classification constitutes a logical progression of scientifically acceptable methodology. Although much of the reported fabric of ufo behaviour runs counter to accepted scientific dogma, we can at least study and classify that fabric in logical and scientifically acceptable fashion. Thus we come to the last two categories, which embrace the stranger and sometimes utterly bizarre facets of the ufo enigma (but which, in themselves, are reported surprisingly often in the sum total of known cases). Disturbing though some of these facets are, they must nevertheless be classified along strictly scientific lines.

6. Close Encounters of the Third Kind (code CE III). To include the standard definition (i.e., Hynek's) of the phenomenon, plus associated and apparently animate entities. These latter may vary from one to many.

It seems to us, however, expedient to divide the standard treatment of these important cases as follows.

- (i) CE IIIa. Entities seen, but without associated ufo, whereby the connection with the phenomenon is conjectural. The level of conjecture may vary widely dependant upon how closely such lone entities resemble those seen on other occasions in definite association with a genuine ufo. Certain "flying" entities fall into this category.
- (ii) CE IIIb. Entities seen, a ufo reported in the general vicinity, but no direct connection provable between the two.
- (iii) CE IIIc. Entities seen to go into or come out of a ufo, whereby a connection between the two is apparently demonstrable.
- (iv) CE IIId. Entities seen entirely as occupants of ufos or as attributes of the phenomenon.

We would propose a further four divisions of such data, as CE IIIe to CE IIIh, to embrace the same four categories as above in sequence except that contact of some kind is claimed between the witness/es and entity/ies.

7. Close Encounters of the Fourth Kind (code CE IV). To embrace an interaction between a witness and the phenomenon which interferes with the normal life or career of the witness, i.e., causes one or more major changes in life patterns. Most claimed abductions and many so-called psychic-contacts belong in this category.

Such claimed contacts appear to fall into two further subdivisions. Of these, the first seems to be largely physical (e.g., an abduction), and the second principally telepathic or psychic. Although telepathic interaction sometimes reportedly occurs in essentially abduction-type cases, we believe that it might be sensible to segregate these two strands, by distinguishing them as CE IVa and CE IVb cases respectively.

In the foregoing seven categories, our method of classification and coding is simple as most of its basic phraseology is already familiar to ufologists internationally. In other words, our codifications speak more or less for themselves, i.e., cases CE I through to CE IV.

We have, however, codified other salient case features as follows: An (Animal disturbance, used here in its wider sense), EM (electromagnetic interference), Ph (physiological effects), Ps (psychological effects) and Tr (physical traces, which include all ground markings). These abbreviations have the double advantage of being brief (a highly desirable development) and of immediately indicating the fuller meaning of what they individually relate to.

By such methods, maximum data transfer (mentioned previously) is possible with minimum effort.

7.

Let us now consider a hypothetical but nonetheless typical eyewitness report by way of demonstrating our argument further. It concerns a silvery disc-shaped phenomenon described by the percipient as being low and as passing within one hundred feet (estimated) of him. The witness could not identify it, although it may really have been an aircraft or a helicopter viewed from an unusual angle. The report lacks other critical detail by which the identity of the phenomenon can be positively established. In previous classifications this would be classified as a CE I case, irrespective of the range of identification options attending it.

Let us now consider two further hypothetical cases to illustrate extensions of our argument. In earlier classifications there would be no distinction between an event, like that above, and one in which the witness's car radio temporarily malfunctioned with excess static, or between that and one in which the car's ignition failed, the object landed, left marks on the ground, and took off again. Both the two latter cases would have been classified simply as CE II cases.

In our proposed new classification system all three above cases can be much more exactly and usefully coded. Thus, the first case would be coded MED (see page 4 *suprā*), the second case would be coded CE I (EM), and the third case coded CE II (EM, (L), TR). This system indicates the order of importance of internal detail in a case, and as such breaks new ground.

Readers will surely agree that our proposed new terminology constitutes a noticeable advance over previous classifications without materially demolishing them, and that it is more accurate and more informative. It is our fervent hope that it will henceforth be widely adopted.

#### INVESTIGATIVE TREATMENT:

As well as knowing things about the content of a report, it is, of course, vital to know to what extent (if any) a case has been investigated. This is especially so where data is collated from several collaborating bodies or groups investigating different events, and which is eventually published in a single journal, e.g. in NUFON News. A method of recording investigative treatment per case is clearly necessary under such circumstances and is, indeed, applicable on a far wider scale. It should, in fact, be applied to all reports, irrespective of source, origin or period.

We here propose the following method of identifying the type of investigative treatment that may have been accorded any particular case. It consists of attaching suffixes (represented by capital letters) to the end of each report.

- A. An on-site investigation conducted by one or more experienced investigators, resulting in a full evaluation.
- B. An investigation conducted insofar as interviews of the witness/es are undertaken, but in which the investigator/s is/are not experienced, or, alternatively, a full on-site investigation is not possible.
- C. The investigation consists of no interviews of witnesses, but does include an on-site investigation. The investigators in such instances can be either experienced or inexperienced, since no full evaluation is possible from such effort.

In connection with the above it is also necessary to extend the coding of reports to cater for those cases that contain much (or little) data, but which are never investigated at all. Two further categories are distinguished, as below, by the suffixes D and E. They represent the negative end of the Investigation Treatment spectrum.

- D. Report consists only of a written eyewitness statement, e.g., a report-form or

an original eyewitness's letter. Such documents may contain abundant data, or may be deficient in much critical detail.

E. Data in reports is entirely "second-hand", e.g., newspaper or magazine articles, of which the latter may actually be third-, fourth, or even fifth-hand by the time the relevant information reaches the ufologist. This situation applies particularly to original foreign-language reports translated into one or more other languages before reaching the ufologist.

In our submission, we feel strongly that only level A and B investigations can possibly provide TRUE UFO evaluations, and that it would greatly enhance the quality of the data if this were both acknowledged and this system adopted by all ufo publications.

As a matter of some interest, one of the present writers (JR) has applied an additional coding system for ufo reports that has proved to be very useful at the more mechanical (some might say mundane) level. This coding system has arisen out of the handling of NUFON/UFOIN/FSR files, and is really a "contents monitor". Thus, for example, we could have something like 20 M, P, S. This coding indicates that the report consists of 20 pages of text, includes maps (M), site photographs (P), and eyewitness sketches of the phenomenon (S). It can be used in a variety of useful ways. It can, for instance, be employed to boost investigative standards (an investigator can contrast the depth of his/her field work with somebody else's), or it can simply provide advance information on the physical nature of the documentation to a researcher elsewhere requiring a photocopied version of it for study or comparative purposes. Such information permits rapid and accurate calculations of the relevant photocopying and postage costs.

It is, of course, not essential that this subsidiary but eminently useful coding system be adopted, but it does have its uses and certainly bears serious consideration.

#### THE FULL SYSTEM:

In conclusion, we combine Ufo Classification and Investigative Treatment codings as follows, using this time a real case. See what you can tell from this combined coding about the contents and reliability of the case, which, in previous classifications, was regarded as a CE III case only.

Oakenholt, Clwyd, North Wales; July 1976: 14.00 BST. CE IIIc (L) (TR, Ph, Ps)  
Level A (52 M, P, S)

A brief description of the case now follows.

A landing, with entities, occurred in July 1976 at 14.00 BST, at the North Wales village of Oakenholt. The entities were seen outside the object, and to get into and out of it. The witness felt physiological effects and suffered a psychological reaction to the event. Traces were left on the ground and were seen by others. The case was investigated by experienced investigators, on site, and included a full evaluation that resulted in a final report 52 pages in length, augmented by maps, sketches, and site photographs.

We think this demonstration justifies the widespread adoption of our proposed new classification and coding system.

We also suspect that our system may require further modification before achieving total international acceptance, and in that connection would be delighted to discuss such matters with any who care to communicate with us. The essential point is that such a system as we have proposed can only enhance the credibility of ufo reports and ufo researchers in the eyes of those still sceptical.

"REPORT FROM CONTACT INTERNATIONAL MEXICO"

by

Ian C.M.Norrie \*

At the UFO Congress held in April 1977, at Acapulco, the famed Mexican Pacific coast resort, it was commented cynically that ufology is just about where it was thirty years ago, the inference being that we are getting nowhere very quickly.

This is not quite true.

What is true is that the pursuit of ufology has remained predominantly the pursuit of the factual --- the "positivist" approach as Ouspensky would have called it. Many have railed against "positivism", but Ouspensky took the first big contemporary tilt at it in his magnum opus "Tertium Organum" of the years of World War I. If he were alive today I suspect that he might have invented a word like "Ufosophy", to denote the amplification of purely intellectual ufology with intuitive methods; and as also to denote the burgeoning need and tendency for everyone who pretends to call him or herself a ufologist to evolve into a Cosmic being as distinct from a mere Earthly being.

Have the great mass of today's ufologists pioneered sufficiently towards "Ufosophy"? I wonder. If the methodology of ufology has advanced tremendously in the last thirty years (we have every conceivable scientific discipline on the job now, teamed with computers, lasers, radar, and the like), has the ufologist as a person got out of the rut of amassing and playing with his knowledge? Analyzing photos, photos, and yet more photos may be as irrelevant as a game of tiddly-winks under the scrutiny of the invisible overseer Who made all.

We are in an age when even the response of plants to human emotions is being scientifically studied. A similar and rather curious response of great significance was found over twenty years ago in the De La Warr laboratories at Oxford, in England, when their 'paranormal' electronic cameras exhibited a marked rapport --- or lack of it --- with the qualities of the operator. Then, they experimented with many varied types of operator. Tycoons were a conspicuous failure, as equally were physicists and technologists. But persons trained in the arts and the humanities came over well.

Are the 'operators' in the ufological investigative field the terrestrial ambassadors that will really bring liaison with other intelligences (whether extra-terrestrial or from some other dimension?)? Their record of disagreement and mud-slinging is remarkable. Renowned ufo investigative groups and individuals are not slow to disparage one another, or to elbow-in for a scoop story. My own ears and eyes caught a surprising amount of this in Acapulco.

The solution is hardly likely to be in the proliferation of cults. The 'institution' all too often disintegrates the 'credo', as Krishnamurti has single-handedly voiced to the world. For him and his disciples the elaborate 'systems' and schools, as well as the charismatic 'master', are so much waste of time. Nor is the solution likely to be in flamboyant arm-beckoning in desert places towards the skies; nor in electrically lighted ufo-ports conceived to, hopefully, attract ufos. That "other intelligence" (whatever it is) has amply demonstrated its power to monitor us for what we are really worth, and is unlikely to be more than amused by such ingenuous efforts. Yes, ingenuous not ingenius, for such efforts are indeed artless and superficial.

What is more likely to attract the attention of that "other intelligence" in an Invisible Society (to parody Jacques Vallee) of what Bergier and Pauwells have termed "mutants". Ouspensky termed such beings simply as "supermen".

The key to this could well lie in the old adage: "Take care of the pennies, and the pounds will take care of themselves". In other words, look after the details and the whole will form naturally. Each and every ufologist is a virtual penny, and the aggregate of alchemically transformed pennies will create a front possibly of far more interest to other intelligences than a welter of xenophobic groups and individuals milling around in a massive intellectual maelstrom.

The Acapulco Congress left me with one curiously symbolic impression. The late Mexican writer and diplomat, Jose Vasconcelos, wrote a significant essay called "La Raza Cosmica" ("The Cosmic Race"), in which he applauds the pragmatic success of the North American nations forged by European immigrants of generally anglo-saxon origin, but deplores the disorderly and disunited history of the Latin American nations. But, he says, the pragmatic success was forged at the cost of an inner sensitivity, which Latin America, despite its failings, does preserve. Vasconcelos believes that a "cosmic race" could emerge from an amalgam of the two.

Acapulco seemed a curiously appropriate place to germinate such a race, such an outlook --- for at the Congress it seemed to be at the very centre of gravity of the two.

We traditionally revile the governments for the lack of progress towards understanding the ufo phenomenon, and its apparent efforts to suppress material and, even, individuals who become embroiled in it; but I whimsically wonder what rating ufo occupants give the Earthbound ufologist. Do they laugh, are they sad, or are they frustrated? Alleged communication between ufo occupants and human beings include, according to the many separate reports, instances of all such reactions. Are terrestrial ufologists so insensitive to the subject they profess to study that they cannot act positively whereby our antics become more acceptable to those who so frequently monitor us from elsewhere?

PER ARDUA AD ASTRA.

---

\* Ing. Ian C.M.Norrie: B.Perez Galdos 218-201, Col.Polanco, Mexico 10, D.F.

---

"THE FIRST LONDON INTERNATIONAL UFO CONGRESS"

by

J.B.Delair.

On Sunday, August 26th., and Monday, August 27th., 1979, the first international ufo Congress ever to be held in Britain was staged at Grand Metropolitan's sumptuous Mount Royal Hotel in London. The organisers were the British Unidentified Flying Objects Research Association (BUFORA), and their principal collaborators were Contact International (UK).

The Congress was a resounding success, with ufologists arriving from many parts of the world, and filling the large auditorium to capacity (standing room only for most of the time). This report records the aims of the congress, its activities, and what it appears to have achieved.

Essentially, the aims of the Congress were twofold. Firstly, it endeavoured to provide an opportunity for the many active ufologists scattered throughout Europe to meet not only each other but respected colleagues from further afield. In this, the Congress was enormously successful. Secondly, it acted as a forum for the interchange of opinions relating to the formulation of an internationally agreed code of field investigation, case classification, and data storage/retrieval systems. In this the Congress was partially successful.

Among the most promising delegates and speakers were Dr J. Allen Hynek, Dr Leo Sprinkle (both from the USA), Dr David Haisell (Canada), Prof. Antonio Ribeira and Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos (both of Spain), Dr Erol Faruk (UK), Dr Roberto Pinotti, Edoardo Russo, and Francesco Izzo (all of Italy), Per Andersson (Denmark), Knut Aashein (Norway), Bertil Kuhlemann (Sweden), Rudy de Groote (Belgium), Douwe Bosga (Netherlands), Alain Asterle (France), Anthony Pace, Peter Hill, Lionel Beer, Timothy O'Brien, Lawrence Dale, and Robert Digby (all of BUFORA), that doyen of British ufology Graham Knewstub, and J. Bernard Delair (Contact International (UK) and MUFON's representative in the UK).

Other noteworthy individuals included Dr Andreas Achillides (Cyprus), B. Biffier (Switzerland), Dr Mahmoud Prasad (India), Ananda Sirisena (Sri Lanka), Philippe Schneyder (France), Paolo di Girolamo (Italy), Edna Smith (Contact International-South Africa), Derek Mansell (Contact International-UK), Edgar Hatvany and Charles Lockwood (BUFORA), Jenny Randles (NUFON), and John Rimmer (MUFON). Many other ufo-logical luminaries also attended, but too numerous to name here. It was a truly international gathering.

It was particularly encouraging to see very free movement and exchange of news, views, and publications between those present, and the near total absence of the cliques and sub-groups that not infrequently occur at gatherings of this kind.

The Congress actually opened on Sunday at 9.30am., when a goodly number of delegates had already arrived and who inspected a large bookstall purveying a comprehensive range of ufo literature and an extensive exhibition which concentrated upon investigative-methodology, and the results of recent research. Indeed, it may be said that the exhibition was characterised by a near total lack of the dramatic and the controversial, and was thoroughly in keeping with the responsible mood of the Congress as a whole.

A series of new full-colour world maps of ufo landings and ufo occupant sightings were exhibited for the first time anywhere and excited considerable interest. These had been prepared by the Data Research unit of Contact International (UK), at Oxford. A copy of the unrivalled MUFON investigators' handbook, which is also the one used by Contact International (UK) field investigators, was also in evidence and, again, roused much interest.

The formal opening of the Congress took place at 11.25am, and was expertly undertaken by Bufora's president, Timothy O'Brian. Thereafter the programme ran as follows.

Sunday:-

11.45am. Lawrence Dale --- "Current BUFORA Investigations".

12.30pm. Break for lunch (many valuable informal meetings and conversations occurred during this and subsequent breaks for refreshments).

14.10pm. Dr Leo Sprinkle --- "Models of UFO Evidence".

15.10pm. Peter Hill --- "From Data to Information".

15.50pm. Break for tea.

16.20pm. Edoardo Russo --- "The Italian UFO Wave of 1978".

17.20pm. Roberto Pinotti --- "More on the Italian UFO Wave of 1978".

17.40pm. Graham Knewstub --- "UFOs".

18.15pm. End of afternoon session.

19.00pm. Special Congress Dinner.

21.00pm. Documentary film --- "UFOs, Past, Present, and Future".

Monday:

09.30am. Visit to the London Planetarium.

10.45am. Break for coffee.

11.15am. J.Bernard Delair --- "Processing UFO Data - The Problems Reappraised".

12.00 noon. Per Andersson --- "Project UFO Data - A system of Electronic Data Processing of UFO/IFO Reports".

14.10pm. Dr J.Allen Hynek --- "Towards a Working Classification of the UFO Phenomenon".

15.15pm. Dr Erol Faruk --- "Soil Analysis - The Delphos Case".

16.00pm. Break for tea.

16.30pm. Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos --- "The Landing Phenomena in Spain".

17.30pm. Peter Hill --- General report on the findings of the "working party" convened to review methodology, classification systems, and data storage/retrieval systems.

18.15pm. Summing-up and closing speeches.

18.30pm. Close of Congress.

From the foregoing it will be seen that a wide range of ufological matters came under the Congress's scrutiny. The "working party" just alluded to, which was chaired throughout by Peter Hill, functioned for most of the Congress in a separate room as a continuous and simultaneous activity. Participating delegates left and rejoined the "working party" as and when papers and other matters of interest to them occurred in the main auditorium.

Peter Hill was unable to report particular definite resolutions by the working party, as a mere two days or parts thereof proved to be insufficient for adequate discussion of its agenda. Much preliminary work had, however, been completed, and it seemed to be the feeling of the "working party" delegates that good initial progress had been made. Certainly all participants agreed that further similar sessions should be arranged for the foreseeable future, and that these should be able to operate effectively in view of the spade-work accomplished by the present "working party". Although there were inevitably some differences of opinion expressed respecting certain aspects of ufo research, the general attitude was that such meetings enabled spokesmen for various bodies to compare and collate such viewpoints to lasting and mutual advantage.

Almost without exception, all attending the Congress thought that it had been a very well-worthwhile exercise and hoped that another would be organised shortly. Meanwhile, we all await BUFORA's publication of the Congress's proceedings with much interest.

Readers' Letters.

Below, we continue to print a selection of the letters and enquiries received at Data Research headquarters. If you have a question to ask or a point of view to express please write direct to the editor at the appropriate address (which is given on page 1). This section of your journal is an open forum for the airing of opinions respecting ufology and related topics and exists for your use.

Dear Mr Delair,

I have been a member of Contact (UK) for only a few months, but already know what a go-ahead group it is. It is definitely the best in Britain just now.

So far I have not seen a flying saucer, but hope that one day (or night) I will. I am sure that there are many who have seen saucers but who have never stepped forward with news of their sightings. If fortunate, I shall not be so reticent, now that I know that a responsible body like Contact (UK) exists.

Yours sincerely,

A.Goldsmith.

(Editorial note: Thank you for your encouraging comments. We hope you do indeed sight a ufo (not flying saucers, please) soon and that you will send us the relevant details. We agree that many must exist who have seen ufos but are reluctant to communicate their experiences to even "responsible" groups such as we try to be).

Dear Editor,

I do not belong to your organization but often read your magazine via a friend of mine who is. I think it is factual, unbiased, and informative, and wish you well in your obviously sincerely efforts to unravel a fascinating problem.

Yours truly,

L.L.Grubb.

(Editorial comment: Again, thank you Mr Grubb. Encouragement of this type is worth rather more than half a dozen subscriptions, even though, of course, one hopes that all readers become subscribing members of Contact (UK).)

Dear Sir,

Can you please tell me why you do not print more pictures and photographs in your magazine? Most other ufo magazines include such illustrations and to have some in "Awareness" would be nice. However, I do like the written contents of your magazine, and hope it continues for many years to come.

Yours faithfully,

F.B.Sprowle.

(Editorial comment: Inclusion of printed illustrations in any publication is unfortunately costly, and the relevant costs spiral upwards at a steady and alarming rate. We do endeavour to include illustrations in "Awareness" from time to time (as also in our sister publication the "UFO Register"), but in order to keep production costs down to reasonable levels they are inevitably few. I would, however, add that some future issues of "Awareness" will be carrying illustrations).

Dear Sirs,

As a regular reader of your interesting journal "Awareness" I notice that it concentrates upon the empirical approach to the ufo phenomenon. What policy has determined this? Would it not be best to prove the ~~existence~~ of the ufo phenomenon by a few well chosen cases containing great detail? When speaking with skeptics I am sometimes asked why just one or two good cases are not forthcoming to prove the reality of the phenomenon. Perhaps you could enlighten me on these points.

Yours faithfully,

Christopher Webber.

(Editorial comment: You raise several interesting points, which I answer in the following order. Firstly, although a few well documented ufo cases do exist (the Delphos landing case for example), isolated cases (no matter how well documented they happen to be) relate only to a single ufo event. As is known, ufos operate globally and over huge periods of time, the earliest definite ufo cases going back to the 17th century, and for many hundreds of years earlier if classical and mediaeval texts are to be believed. Even the best documented case can convey no inkling of (a) global distribution, and (b) temporal distribution. Yet ufos embrace these two "areas", and must do so for a reason. The best documented case of all is unlikely to reveal to us the reason for this global and temporal distribution, hence the necessity to collect ufo reports from all regions and periods. Again, resting one's argument for the existence of ufos on a single case is, at best, precarious, for it assumes that we understand sufficient of the ufo drama to uncontroversially assume that the selected "good" case is typical of the remainder (i.e., the less well documented cases). Empirically processed data, such as you refer to, permits hitherto unknown trends to be discerned and investigated. Sole incidents do not necessarily include clues to trends like these which only become evident when many cases are brought together. These are the reasons for our policy of tackling the ufo phenomenon empirically.

When one sees a detailed comprehensive case-list for any particular year or region, it quickly becomes obvious that one doesn't have to prove the existence of ufos. They prove themselves, by sheer weight of numbers).

Dear Mr Delair,

I have recently heard that ufos are really evil or at least not friendly. All the earlier ufo literature, especially those of the first contactees, claimed that ufos were friendly and benevolent. I should like to know why there is this sudden switch of interpretation, and would like to know what others think of this trend. Personally I think ufos are neither good nor bad, especially as they may come from several different places. Perhaps you would print this letter in your magazine so that others can answer my question.

Yours sincerely,

C.W.Morgan.

(Editorial comment: The recent emphasis on demonic or satanic origins for ufos is certainly of interest and contrasts with the earlier friendly or "space brother" origins assigned to them by the ufologists of the 1940's, 1950's and early 1960's. It is, in fact, a new trend that deserves closer investigation. The above does not imply that none of the older ufologists accorded ufos evil intentions, of course, as one recalls that the late Harold T. Wilkins wrote that ufos, allegedly from Saturn, were malevolent, although, like our correspondent, he admitted that others appeared to be friendly and were seemingly from different sources.

Readers must have some views on this aspect of ufology, so let us have your letters. Interestingly, two of the books reviewed on later pages of this issue deal with satanic ufo origins).

Dear Sir,

I would like to make correspondence with anybody interested in corresponding and talking about ufos with me. I would exchange information and maybe teach them Portuguese. I don't know any English at all; that's why I would like to make correspondence because that would enlarge my knowledge of it.

Here, in Brazil, are several ufo groups and large organizations. Our most prominent leaders are General Moacyr Uchôa, Professor Flavio A. Pereira, D. Irene Granch, and Fernando Cleto Nunes. There are others as well. Here in Bahia, I am a member of the UFO group named G.Paz (Grupo de Pesquisas Aero-Espaciais Zenith), which now numbers about 48 persons. I can tell those who write to me many things about this group and about the others groups in Brazil, as well as much information about ufo cases we have investigated.

Now I thank you in advance(d)

Forgive my wrong english.

Cordially,

Marcelo M.Romano: Praça Conselheiro Almeida Couto 266, apt.902 -Salvador, Bahia 40000, Brazil.

(Editorial comment: I am sure that most of us would like to write Portuguese as fluently and error-free as Mr Romano. Well, here is a chance for all those aspiring to wangle a holiday in Rio or São Paulo to indulge their aims and hopes. Undoubtedly Mr Romano would be able to send much little-known ufo material to his correspondents, while, of course, if you are keen to learn Portuguese..... Now get out your writing paper and pens)

Dear Mr Passey,

I was given your address and I want to ask if it's possible to get in contact with others interested in ufos in any way. I'll be very grateful. I can send you information about Danish cases. I will be waiting for any answer.

With many thanks,

Pia Berish Hansen: Sjaellandsgade 91, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark.

(Editorial comment: Here is another opportunity to strike up correspondence with an overseas ufologist. Somebody write to Pia quickly, please. Who knows? Danish pastry by the ton may be a reward).

BOOK REVIEWS

by  
J.B. Delair.

Below are a number of reviews of ufo books received at Data Research's library during the past few months. It has not been physically possible to read all of them yet, but those not reviewed below will be assessed in later issues of this publication.

"UFOs and the Christian",

Rev. Eric Inglesby.

Pp.162: Regency Press Ltd (London).

Price £2.40p.

By any standard this is a most unusual book, and, because it does not rehash the same old material, as has regrettably been the case with many recent tomes, it deserves to be widely read. It is also unusual in that it is the only book on ufos by a Church of England clergymen who, with 30 years of ufo research to his credit, is remarkably well qualified to discuss the phenomenon.

"UFOs and the Christian" is also unusual in that the author concludes that most, if not all, ufos are occult and, in particular, of probable satanic origin. The evidence adduced for this is interesting, although, of course, the conclusion is a personal one, as indeed are all conclusions about ufos. The author cites very many instances of apparently satanic ufo behaviour, and also numerous excerpts and passages from the scriptures, to support his contentions. The book, its argument, and the author's warnings, all stand or fall according to the viewpoint of the reader. If the reader happens not to be a Christian then the book will have little or no impact, and no message or cautionary tale to impart. But this reviewer, upon completing the book, was left with a vague feeling of unease that somewhere along the line the Rev. Inglesby has put his finger on something that is not "quite right" in the overall ufo arena. That something (whatever it is) may be due to an aspect of the phenomenon that our deficient knowledge prevents us from properly understanding, but it may also be due to the evil forces described by the author. Only the reader can decide how the book should be regarded.

Devoid of illustrations, but replete with a selected bibliography totalling 33 titles, "UFOs and the Christian" is fortunately lacking in typographical errors, and unfortunately lacking in an index. Divided into three parts, respectively titled UFO Odyssey, Sins and Saucers, and UFOs and the Bible, it can perhaps get by without such an appendage, although any future edition would do well to include one. Altogether an interesting if novel approach to the ufo enigma.

"The Philadelphia Experiment",

by Charles Berlitz and William Moore.

Pp.187: Souvenir Press (London).

Price £4.95p.

This is a quite remarkable book that, strictly speaking, only marginally touches upon the ufo theme pure and simple. But all those familiar with the writings of Morris K. Jessup, the so-called Allende Letters, and the extraordinary affair of a teleported US Navy destroyer, cannot fail to be absorbed by this book, for not only does it discuss these subjects anew and in far greater documented detail than hitherto, but also shows how there may well have been connections with the ufo mystery. Jessup's death is shown to have been suspicious in the extreme, and the previously elusive Carlos Allende is not only shown to have been very real but a photograph of him is published in this book as well. Indeed, there are many interesting photographs, including one of the teleported destroyer, which at the

time of the teleportation experiment (1943) was known as the USS Eldridge DE73, but which is now serving with the Greek navy as the "Leon".

The involvement of Professor Albert Einstein and Dr John von Neumann in this experiment which went so horribly wrong is ably demonstrated, and the later reasons for the official policy of "hushing-up" the affair are well reasoned. The connections with Thomas Townsend Brown and James R. Wolfe are even more amazing (and disturbing), while the fact that an official directive allocating to the experiment a priority even higher than that given the atom bomb development comes as something of a shock. The patient research underlying all such statements is a monument to the resolve and perspicacity of William Moore, who appears to have done the lion's share of amassing the material for this book.

Both Moore and Berlitz, however, are careful to point out that no incontrovertible proof has yet been found for the actuality of the aforesaid experiment, but do stress that the numerous new pieces of information apparently relating to such an event are now overwhelmingly in favour of its really having taken place. On reading this book one finds it difficult not to agree with the authors.

Even more unsettling is the suggestion that alien technology, possibly acquired by high-ranking US officials and research personnel, underlay the experiment. That technology presumably came from some secret but direct contact with alien agents or was extracted from "captured" alien hardware, which, in this context, would of necessity have been crashed ufos. One hardly needs remind readers that stories of retrieved crashed "saucers" from the American desert wastes have been circulating for years and have recently received much attention, especially from noted US ufo authority Leonard Stringfield. But such crashes are always alleged to have occurred in the late 1940's, whereas the Philadelphia experiment, as it came to be known, took place in 1943, or several years before crashed "saucers". Berlitz's and Moore's allegation is certainly startling and will unquestionably generate much debate. That they also suggest that such alien contact has possibly been maintained right up to the time of writing is something to set a cat among pigeons. If true, that alone would indicate why such a heavy censorship and curtain of silence has been operated from the highest levels concerning the reality of ufos; it might also explain the admittedly mysterious demise of Morris K. Jessup, who, perhaps, was getting too close to the truth for his own good. Much the same was said much later when Dr James McDonald committed alleged "suicide". Certainly this book gives one much food for thought.

Compelling reading, the book is almost wholly free of typographical errors, and contains a useful chronological bibliography. It could, however, do with an index, which, for unfathomed reasons, seem these days to be absent from too many tomes. It is excellent value for the asking price, and would make a marvelous Christmas gift. All ufologists should be familiar with the contents of this book.

US officialdom, if Berlitz's and Moore's claims and arguments have a factual basis, may well have much to answer for, in more ways than one. Read this book and you will find out why.

#### UFOs: What on Earth is Happening?

John Weldon and Zola Levitt.

Pp.175: Bantam Books Inc. (New York).

Price (in UK) 60p.

This is another volume arguing that UFOs and their activities are essentially satanic. The writers argue at a different level from the Rev. Inglesby (reviewed opposite), and are on many occasions apparently naive in their approach. Nonetheless, they offer a fair sprinkling of evidence for unfriendly ufos that certainly

bears thinking about. The trouble with material of this kind is that it is, as on this occasion, largely wrenched out of overall ufological context, whereby, by such processes, it becomes comparatively easy to prove almost anything. This reviewer feels that Weldon and Levitt have done almost precisely that, their conclusions being accordingly rather suspect. On the credit side, however, they provide innumerable references throughout their text in support of their thesis and can truthfully state that few books about ufos are better cross-referenced. This reviewer cannot help feeling that so much of the material interpreted as satanic or demonic in origin by these authors is in fact actually innocent enough but invested with a superficially malignant veneer merely because we do not possess sufficient knowledge to understand it for what it is really is. Ignorance (at any level) usually breeds fear and awe, and that which fails to accord with our ideas of what is good and benign seems inevitably to be regarded as evil and fearsome. When ones views are entrenched in religious texts those views tend to be at least slanted towards particular overviews of everyday life. Material that is apparently at variance with it --- and the whole of ufology is at variance with Man's cherished laws of physics --- is therefore suspect and very likely is interpreted as unethical (by our standards) if not downright malignant.

These remarks are necessary when we note the backgrounds of the authors. Weldon, for example, is at The Light and Power House (a biblical training school) in Westwood, California, and a research editor for the Christian Research Institute. Levitt is a Hebrew Christian and a psychoanalyst and marriage-counsellor. It is noteworthy that among his previous books are Satan in the Sanctuary and The Coming Russian Invasion of Israel. It is, perhaps, not too surprising that, with commitments along such lines, these authors feel that ufos are threatening (and therefore evil, and therefore satanic). It is this reviewer's opinion that this is an interesting diversion in the ufo literature field but not one to be taken too literally. Its multitudinous references are the best part of it.

The Ufonauts,  
Prof. Hans Holzer.

Pp.301: Granada Publishing Ltd. (London).  
Price (in UK) 95p.

This is a fascinating tome by an eminently readable author who has researched his subject --- ufo occupants --- in considerable detail. The book is composed of ten chapters, with titles such as "The Humanoids - What They Look Like", "UFO Crews vs. the People of Earth", "The Mating of Humans with Space People", and "Where Do the Ufonauts come from, and why?". Such titles will give potential readers a good idea of the ground covered by this writer.

Rather inevitably this book assumes that ufos and their occupants are from some point in space, and that they traverse vast tracts of it in order to visit our planet. Indeed, the whole of Holzer's arguments revolve around that assumption. But, as is well known, such an origin for ufos and their occupants, however initially attractive, has serious drawbacks and has for some years steadily been losing ground to other possible explanations. Holzer's assumption that ufos and the ufonauts are extraterrestrial (in the space sense) is, however, the only serious flaw in an otherwise excellent effort, and his discussions of ufonaut activities on Earth and what they may portend are masterly.

The Ufonauts has no index (again), and is not as well referenced as it might be. Nevertheless, it says much for Holzer's powers as a writer that these defects tend to recede when reading his text. Good by any score, this book should prove absorbing reading for those already familiar with ufology in general. At a mere 95p. it is extraordinarily good value.

SPACE AGE PUBLICATIONS

The following books are in stock or can be obtained.

<u>CLOSE ENCOUNTERS: THE STRANGE TRUTH ABOUT UFOS</u> , by Alan West and David Jeffries.....	£2.50p.
<u>MINDS THROUGH SPACE AND TIME</u> , by Brad Steiger and Loring C. Williams.....	96p.
<u>A CATALOGUE OF 200 TYPE-I UFO EVENTS IN SPAIN AND PORTUGAL</u> , by	
Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos.....	£3.50p.
<u>A HELICOPTER UFO ENCOUNTER OVER OHIO</u> , by Jennie Ziedman.....	£6.00p.
<u>THE EDGE OF REALITY</u> , By J.Allen Hynek and Jacques Vallee.....	£4.50p.
<u>THE ZETA RETICULI INCIDENT</u> , by Terence Dickinson.....	£1.40p.
<u>FLYING SAUCERS AND THE STRAIGHT LINE MYSTERY</u> , by Aime Michel (rare).....	£5.00p.
<u>CLOSE ENCOUNTERS: A FACTUAL UFO REPORT</u> , by K.Larsen.....	£9.00p.
<u>UFO REVIEW</u> , by T.G.Bekley.....	70p.
<u>UFOS AROUND THE WORLD</u> , by T.G.Bekley.....	£3.00p.
<u>ORGONE ENERGY</u> , by Jerome Eden.....	£5.00p.
<u>ANIMAL MAGNETISM</u> , by Jerome Eden.....	£7.00p.
<u>VIEW OVER EDEN</u> , by Jerome Eden.....	£6.50p.
<u>UFOS AND THE CHRISTIAN</u> , by Rev.Eric Inglesby.....	£3.00p.
<u>THE NIGHT MUTILATORS</u> , by Gene Duplantier.....	£2.00p.
<u>PRELUDER TO THE LANDING ON PLANET EARTH</u> , by Stuart Holroyd.....	£1.55p.
<u>SOMEONE ELSE IS ON OUR MOON</u> , By George Leonard.....	£1.55p.
<u>THE IRON SUN -- CROSSING THE UNIVERSE THROUGH BLACK HOLES</u> , by Adrian Berry.....	£1.25p.
<u>THE ROOTS OF CONCIOUSNESS</u> , by J.Mishlove (psychic and ufo phenomena).....	£6.95p.
<u>THE GHOST OF FLIGHT 401</u> , by John G.Fuller.....	£1.30p.
<u>THE COLLAPSING UNIVERSE</u> , by Isaac Azimov.....	£1.10p.
<u>MESSAGES FROM THE STARS</u> , by Ian Ridpath.....	£1.20p.
<u>TIME TO BE TOLD</u> , by J.D.Middleton.....	£1.30p.
<u>SUNGODS IN EXILE: SECRETS OF THE DZOPA OF TIBET</u> , by Karyl Robin Evans. Edited by David Agamon, M.A. (outer space origins).....	£4.10p.
<u>VITA FLORUM - HEALTH THROUGH FLOWERS</u> , by Elizabeth Bellhouse.....	£4.10p.
<u>UFOS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE</u> , by Robert Emenegger.....	£1.00p.
<u>LIFE ON EARTH</u> , by David Attenborough.....	£8.80p.
<u>NEW REALITIES MAGAZINE</u> , illustrated back issues only available.....	each £1.10p.

All prices include postage and packing. Book lists sent free with orders, but 20p. required if requested separately. All enquiries concerning orders and books should include a stamped addressed envelope.

Prices and availability of items subject to change without notice.

All orders and enquiries to Miss Susanne Stebbing at the following address.

41, Terminus Drive,  
Beltinge,  
near Herne Bay, Kent, CT6 6PR.

---

LANTERN, a quarterly journal of East Anglian oddities, edited by Ivan Bunn, 3 Dunwich Way, Lowestoft, Suffolk.

One year's subscription only 85p. This journal is recommended for its continuously interesting contents, not all of a ufological nature, regularly featured in it.

---

BOOKS FOR SALE (Direct from Stock).PRICES INCLUDE POSTAGE.Hardbacks

GODS OF AIR AND DARKNESS, by Richard Mooney. 200 pages (a bargain).....£2.00p.  
PIECE FOR A JIG-SAW, by Leonard Cramp. 238 pages, illustrated.....£4.05p.  
URI: BIOGRAPHY OF URI GELLER, by Andrija Puharich. 285 pages.....£3.00p.

Paperbacks

BEYOND EARTH, by Ralph and Judy Blum. 248 pages, illustrated (recommended) .....

.....£0.90p.

CELESTIAL PASSENGERS: UFOs AND SPACE TRAVEL, by M.Sachs.....220 pages..£1.00p.  
GODS AND SPACEMEN IN THE ANCIENT EAST, by Raymond Drake.....240 pages..£0.50p.  
GODS AND SPACEMEN IN THE ANCIENT WEST, by Raymond Drake.....240 pages..£0.60p.  
OMENS OF AWARENESS, by David Tansley. 210 pgaes, illustrated.....£1.90p.  
STRANGER THAN SCIENCE, by Frank Edwards. (1st published 1959) 180 pages.£0.55p.  
Strange Worlds, by Frank Edwards (1st published 1964).....238 pages..£0.60p.  
THE UFORNAUTS, by Prof.Hans Holzer.....(contactee cases).....300 pages..£1.10p.  
THE UNDISCOVERED COUNTRY, by Stephen Jenkins. 265 pages, 8 plates.....£1.90p.

Also in stock:-

Flying Saucer Review, .....per copy.....80p.  
True (USA) magazine.....per copy.....65p.  
Search magazine.....per copy.....85p.  
Alpha magazine.....per copy.....70p.

Send 9" x 5" s.a.e. for lists. Please send remittance with order to:-

Lionel Beer

15 Freshwater court, Crawford Street, London, W1H 1HS.

ALBERT ONORI offers immense world-wide ufo newspaper clipping collections (over 1,000 separate items), all in the English language, dating 1950-1977. Later years in preparation. For further details send S.A.E., or three international postal coupons to guarantee airmail reply, to:-

Mr Albert Onori, 71 St.Andrew's Blvd., Clifton, New Jersey, USA.

UFO NETWORK: A comprehensive Information Service on UFOs. Send S.A.E. for details to UFO NETWORK, 2 St.Ivian Court, Colney Hatch Lane, London, N.10.

UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE. Probably the best regular newsclipping service there is on ufos, Bigfoot, and related topics. Up-to-date reports on a world-wide basis, and foreign press accounts given in translated form. A must for every serious ufologist. Each month subscribers receive a 20-page report reproduced by photo-offset.

For subscription information and sample pages from our immaculate service, write today by sending a stamped addressed envelope to: UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE, at Route 1, Box 220, Plumerville, Arkansas 72127, USA.

You will never regret it.